

REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-20 are rejected.

Claims 1-5, 9-14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Chandler et al. (U.S. 5,296,690).

Claims 6-8 and 15-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Claims 1, 10 and 19 are amended, and, thus, claims 1-20 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested.

No new matter has been added.

REJECTION

The Office Action maintains from the previous Office Action rejection of claims 1-5, 9-14, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chandler et al. (US Patent No. 5,296,690).

In the Response To Arguments, the Examiner asserts that the claims recite, “detecting **one or more** two-dimensional code regions,” and also “Chandler teaches that one region corresponding to one code is detected” (Office Action page 5, lines 3-9).

The independent claims are 1, 10, and 19, and are amended, using claim 1 as an example, as follows:

1. (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A two-dimensional code extraction method comprising:
 - inputting image data;
 - scanning said input image data in a square block unit of MXN pixels (M and N are positive integers);
 - detecting blocks that satisfy specific conditions from said scanned blocks;
 - detecting ~~one or more~~ a plurality of two-dimensional code regions corresponding to respective ~~one or more~~ plurality of two-

dimensional codes, each two-dimensional code region comprising a number of neighboring and continuous blocks from among said detected blocks that satisfy specific conditions from said scanned blocks; and

extracting **the one or more two dimensional codes from among the detected plurality of two-dimensional code regions that have more than a predetermined number of the neighboring and continuous blocks.**

Further, in response to the Office Action Response to Arguments on page 5, item 5, beginning at line 10, alleging that Chandler's "region growing technique reads upon the claimed aforementioned limitation in that the region of the region growing technique is derived from detected cells 49 (blocks) that have a particular cell score (satisfy specific condition)," in contrast to Chandler, the claimed present invention provides, "**extracting the one or more two dimensional codes from among the detected plurality of two-dimensional code regions that have more than a predetermined number of the neighboring and continuous blocks.**"

In other words, Chandler's finding of "bar code activity" at operation 78 (FIG. 5A and column 7, line 52 to column 8, line 8) and region growing technique "applied to the cell activity score map" at operation 86, to "**determine center of region of bar code activity, and likely horizontal and vertical extent**" (FIG. 5B and column 8, lines 9-23), fails to disclose, or suggest taking into consideration, the claimed present invention's, "two-dimensional code regions that have **more than a predetermined number of the neighboring and continuous blocks.**"

Support for the independent claims and the claim amendment can be found, for example, in paragraph 58 and FIGS. 1, 7, and 8 of the present Application.

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, withdrawal of the rejection of pending claims and allowance of pending claims is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: October 13, 2005

By: 
Mehdi Sheikerz
Registration No. 41,307

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501